



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,151	08/24/2001	Sylvette Maisonnier	ESSR: 052US	3004
7590	05/02/2006		EXAMINER	
Mark B. Wilson Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P. Suite 2400 600 Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701			TUCKER, PHILIP C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1712		
DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/939,151	MAISONNIER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip C. Tucker	1712	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 24-27,30-44 and 47-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 24-27,30-44,47-66,74 and 75 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 67-73 and 76-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 76-80 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 76 is a method claim, in which line 11 states "wherein a substrate comprises a film of the latex". Such is not a method step, and does not add a limitation to the method. Applicant should add a method step of placing the latex on the substrate to be complete. Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 67-73 and 76-80 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent no. 6770710. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although US 6770710 differs by using the term primer instead of initiator, the method of the claims of US 6770710 uses the same components as in the present invention, and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Claim 15 of US 6770710 teaches the use of sodium persulfate, as in step (iii) of claim 67. A miniemulsion is a type of emulsion, and renders the broad teaching of the emulsion of the current claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Claim 1 of US 6770710 teaches the that the primer may be added during various stages of the polymerization, including after the formation of the emulsion, which would render claim 67 obvious.. With respect to claim 72, the claims of US 6770710 teach the use of alkyl acrylates, with the specification teaching ethyl, propyl and butyl as preferred, thus rendering the homopolymer of claim 72 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (see MPEP 804 and In re Vogel therein). Claim 76 is not seen as distinguishing, since the substrate is not part of the method.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1712

4. Claims 67-73 and 76-80 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6740699. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although the use of an initiator is not specified, the claims are obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the following reasons. The utility of an initiator for the polymerization of C=C groups in forming a latex is universally known, and is an obvious step in polymerization to one of ordinary skill in the art. US 6740699 in the specification, further teaches the use of water soluble initiators such as persulfates which would render the present claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (see MPEP 804 and Vogel therein). With respect to claim 72, the claims of US 6740699 teach the use of alkyl acrylates, with the specification teaching ethyl, propyl and butyl as preferred, thus rendering the homopolymer of claim 72 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Claim 76 is not seen as distinguishing, since the substrate is not part of the method.

5. Claims 24-27, 30-44, 47-66, 74 and 75 are allowable over the art of record.

6. Applicant's amendment and arguments have been reviewed. Such amendments have overcome the rejection over JP 10-25471. Further review of the '710 and '669 patents, indicate that the scope of claim 67 is rendered obvious under obvious double patenting.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C. Tucker whose telephone number is 571-272-1095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, Flexible schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Philip C Tucker
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1712

PCT-3967